DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 035 JC 970 310

TITLE	Pensacola Junior College Institutional Effectiveness Progress Report, 1996. Year 4, 1995-1996 Academic Year Progress-to-Date.
INSTITUTION	Pensacola Junior Coll., FL. Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness.
REPORT NO	PJC-R-96-516
PUB DATE	31 Jul 96
NOTE	29p.; Eleven tables are printed on colored paper.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Outcomes Assessment; Community Colleges; Evaluation Criteria; Instructional Effectiveness; *Organizational Objectives; *School Effectiveness; *Self Evaluation (Groups); Tables (Data); Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Pensacola Junior College FL

ABSTRACT

In spring 1996, Florida's Pensacola Junior College (PJC) undertook the fourth assessment of institutional effectiveness using an assessment plan developed between 1990 and 1993. Outcomes were examined for the 1995-96 academic year with respect to the 51 goals, 147 objectives, and 253 indicators of effectiveness identified by the assessment plan in 16 functional areas. Area supervisors were requested to report on at least one objective and one indicator for each of the goals. Results of the process included the following: (1) 97 of the 253 indicators were selected to be reported for 1995-96, although with multiple reports for some indicators a total of 233 indicator reports were received; (2) 90.1% (n=210) of the indicators were shown to have been fully met in terms of designated levels of performance; and (3) indicators that did not meet standards included increasing annual student contacts by 2%, correctly placing 90% of first-time in college students, achieving a 5% annual increase in students, and including grade distributions in faculty evaluations. It was concluded that the central mission of the college was affirmed by the results of the assessment and it was recommended that the assessment be continued in 1996-97; that the number of indicators be increased with special emphasis on those indicators that relate to outcome productivity measures rather than measures of internal processes. Tables showing outcomes by indicator and indicators that were not reported are included. (HAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 409 035

PENSACOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
PROGRESS REPORT
1996

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

YEAR 4

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

1995-1996 Academic Year

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Progress - to - Date

with

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. W. McLeod
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Comprehensive Goal, Objective, Indicator, and Use Statement Data;
Analysis of Indicators, Conclusions and Recommendations.

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Pensacola Junior College
Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness
R-96-516

7-31-96

JC 970 310

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction: In an on-going effort to improve college operations and to improve the documentation of institutional effectiveness, a plan of assessment was developed in 1990-1993. In the spring of 1993, an initial run of the Pensacola Junior College Institutional Effectiveness Plan was undertaken for at least a single indicator and objective for each goal in the plan. In the spring of 1994, the second institutional effectiveness assessment was made according to this plan. A third assessment was made in the spring of 1995. Following are the results of the fourth institutional effectiveness assessment undertaken in the spring of 1996. It must be noted that this report is not a final product, only the fourth step of an evolving process.

Index:

Executive Summary ..... page 2

Analysis ..... page 3

Conclusions ..... page 4

Recommendations ..... page 5

Comprehensive Goal, Objective, Indicator and Use Statements, TABLE I ..... page 6

Analysis of Institutional Effectiveness Indicators, TABLE II ..... page 16

List of Unreported Indicators Through 1995-1996, TABLE III ..... page 17

A Word of Caution: These indicators are intended to be data for affirmation of the mission of the college and for continued improvement of the institution. The success of the process requires a non-threatening environment in which the aggressive pursuit of evaluative data, both positive and negative, is encouraged. Consequently the achievement or non-achievement of a given indicator standard, while very important to the operational unit, is not as important to the purpose of institutional effectiveness assessment as is the fact that the college has examined that facet of the college's productivity, has generated concrete information concerning it, and has proceeded to act on that information for the long-term improvement of the college.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Year 4 Institutional Effectiveness Assessment (1995 - 1996)
(R-96-516, 7-31-96)

The fourth institutional effectiveness assessment was undertaken by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness in the spring of 1996, for the 1995-1996 academic year. This used the plan developed by the Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce between 1990 and 1993, which consisted in the fourth year evaluation of sixteen functional areas, 51 goals, 147 objectives and 253 possible indicators. For the fourth run, area supervisors were requested to select one objective and one indicator for each of the goals, although some selected more and others less. Reports of performance indicators for these objectives were received through July 31, 1996. Several follow-up efforts were made. The process was successfully completed this year for the fourth time.

Findings:

(1) A total of 233 indicator reports were received for 1995-1996 (some indicator standards were used by more than one unit.)

(2) Of these, 210 or 90.1% were fully met in terms of designated levels of performance.

(3) Twenty-three did not meet the specified standards.

(4) Data from these assessments were used to a high degree (96.6%).

Conclusions:

The central mission of the college is affirmed by the results of this assessment, unit-by-unit across the college.

Recommendations:

(1) The process must be continued in 1996-1997, at which time a general evaluation of the entire five-year process cycle will be conducted.

(2) Continued simplification of the process is in order; especially in the reduction of the number of indicators.

(3) Each institutional unit should strive to focus more of its institutional effectiveness efforts upon indicators that show basic college productivity respective of its mission, rather than process activity measures. Although processes of the college are important they represent means toward ends rather than true outcome productivity.

ANALYSIS

1. It is given under the current plan that each functional area (n=16) can have multiple goals (n=51), which in turn may have multiple objectives (n=147) and multiple indicators (n=253). In addition there is the potential for multiple reports based on individual indicators. In 1995-1996 assessment, there was to have been an indicator reported for each goal; that would have been a minimum 51 indicator responses. There were, in fact, 97 individual indicators actually selected to be reported. Some received multiple responses for the same objective, some were single responses for a total of 233 indicator reports in all. Thus, the indicator reporting rate was 38.3% for 1995-1996 (that is, the percentage of individual standards reported at least one time). A summary of these reports is presented in TABLE I.

2. TABLE II gives detailed information on these data. Of the 233 total indicator standard reports received, 210 or 90.1% of the prescribed standards were met or exceeded. Of all the reports received, the reporters stated in 225 or 96.6% of these instances that the report data (whether the standard was achieved or not) was used by the reporting unit for its improvement. Additional non-standard versions of standing indicators and new alternate indicators were reported by some units.

3. TABLE III displays indicators that have yet to be examined (that is, not reported in 1992-1993, 1993-1994, 1994-1995, or 1995-1996) but which must be assessed at least once during the five-year cycle of evaluation.

CONCLUSIONS

It is important to recognize that this evaluative process is intended to assess the assessment process itself as well as to assess college performance each year.

1. Overall indicator response suggests that PJC units are meeting or exceeding prescribed performance levels for the objectives assessed; and as a result, are meeting college mission goals.

2. This fourth run was adequate. The level of cooperation by the participating reporters was excellent in the fourth run. The reporting system and paper trail worked well and continued to have a minimal impact on college resources.

3. Too many indicators were found to be *process* rather than *product*-oriented. Virtually no (3) *product* indicators were chosen this year. More product outcome measures are needed. However, the *product* emphasis on the new institutional accountability process, the Performance Incentive Funding effort and the new Performance-Based Budgeting system more than make up for any *product* shortcoming in this effectiveness process.

4. A continuing overreliance on satisfaction surveys was noted. There should be a curtailment of survey-based indicators and more emphasis placed on outcome measures of a quantitative nature when the second five-year cycle is planned.

5. Subtle changes in some objectives and indicators continued to be made in the course of the process. This resulted in some indicator objectives having evolved into objectives more appropriate to unit operational plans or institution strategic plan objectives. Most of these were subjected to the formal review and approval process. Other unit leaders made major modifications of standard indicator measures. Still others elected to use new alternative indicator measures.

6. Little opposition to the process was noted, though lack of full understanding of the process and its purpose is frequently encountered. (Some difference in opinion seems to exist between those who see the process as a mirror of SACS *Criteria* and those who envision it as a test of college mission compliance.) Some see the process as an added burden. Others confuse it with Strategic Planning , the SACS reaffirmation processes and the state accountability process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That:

1. The process be continued, simplified and refined.

2. College leadership continue to emphasize the importance of the process.

3. In 1996-1997, the total number of indicator reports must be increased, with special emphasis on those indicators that relate to outcome productivity measures rather than measures of internal processes (see TABLE III). This is the last opportunity in this cycle for units to complete their planned indicators.

4. Individual reporting units continue to utilize the results of these assessments for continuous improvement.

5. Continued efforts must be made to educate PJC personnel on the institutional effectiveness process.

6. In 1996-1997, begin planning preliminary work for the new 1997-2002 institutional effectiveness cycle.

TABLE I.
SUMMARY TABULATION OF PJC INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS (a)
1995-1996
(YEAR IV)

Following is the enumeration and status of all institutional effectiveness indicators reported for the 1995-1996 academic year. The full report with supporting documentation for each is presented in APPENDIX A. [Column #1 displays indicator Functional Area, #2 is the cumulative indicator count for this year, #3 is the Functional Area, Goal, Objective and Indicator Criteria citations, #4 the Strategic Plan Goal(s) cited, #5 the abbreviated Indicator standard, #6 the actual data for 1995-1996, #7 the achievement status of the standard, #8 commentary, and #9 whether or not these data were used by the reporting unit.] PJC mission output measures (column #5) are highlighted.

TABLE I.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Functional Area:	**No.**	**Citation:**	**Strategic Goal(s) Cited:**	**Abbreviated Indicator Standard:**	**Actual Data for 1995-1996:**	**Was Standard Achieved?**	**Commentary:**	**Was Data Used**
I ADMISSIONS:	1	I A 2 a	7, 9 11	Improve class schedule	Done	Yes		Yes
	2	I A 3 a	11	Improve student records system	Done	Yes		Yes
	3	I B 1 a	9	Increase annual student contacts by 2%	< +2%	No	EMAS under consideration	Yes
	4	I C 1 a	1,7	90% correct placement of FTIC	67%	No		Yes
	5	I D 2 a	1,7	80% utilization of CPT	> 90%	Yes		Yes
II COMPLETION REQUIREMENTS:	6	II B 2 a	1, 2, 11	100% remediation of student sample	100%	Yes		Yes
III CURRICULUM:	7	III A 2 c	1, 2, 11	5-year curriculum review	Done	Yes		Yes
	8	III B 1 c	1, 2, 11	70% high satisfaction by employers of graduates.	86%	Yes		Yes
	9	III B 1 d	1, 2, 11	70% high satisfaction of employers, vocational skills.	87.5%	Yes		Yes
	10	III B 1 e	1, 2, 11	75% vocational program graduation.	76%	Yes		Yes
	11	III B 2 a	1, 2, 11	Proper general education in vocational education	Done	Yes		Yes
	12	III B 2 b	1, 2, 11	70% success prediction by prerequisites	95%	Yes		Yes
	13	III B 2 c	3	5-year curriculum review (A.S.)	Done	Yes		Yes
	14	III B 2 d	1, 2, 11	70% student satisfaction with course sequences	93.75%	Yes		Yes
IV COMMUNITY PROGRAMS: Secondary Education	15	IV A 1 a	1, 3, 4	50% of Escambia County dropouts enrolled at PJC	N/A	(Yes)	Enrollment rate not established	Yes
Secondary Education	16	IV A 3 a	1, 3, 4	70% "D" or higher in AHS courses	98 & 99%	Yes		Yes
Secondary Education	17	IV A 3 b	1,3,4	50% of students will complete courses	54 & 57%	Yes		Yes
Adult Basic Education	18	IV B 3 c	4	70% of faculty will receive high student satisfaction	N/A	(Yes)	Satisfaction data not provided	Yes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE I.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Functional Area:	**No.**	**Citation:**	**Strategic Goal(s) Cited:**	**Abbreviated Indicator Standard:**	**Actual Data for 1995-1996:**	**Was Standard Achieved?**	**Commentary:**	**Was Data Used**
Distance Learning	19	IV C 4 a	4	70% of faculty will receive high student satisfaction	75%	Yes		Yes
LifeLong Learning	20	IV D 1 a	10	5% annual increase in students	N/A	(Yes)	Rate increase data not provided	Yes
Community Campus	21	IV D 1 a	4	5% annual increase in students	+2.6%	No		Yes
Educational T V	22	IV F 1 a	11	50% completion of cable channel	50% (appx.)	Yes		Yes
V FACULTY	23	V A 1 b	8	Transcripts on file for all faculty (sample)	8 of 106 not	No	Action to keep 100% compliance	Yes
	24	V A 2 b	1, 3	All faculty SACS qualified (full-time)	Done	Yes	Specific data not provided	Yes
	25	V A 3 a	1, 3	All faculty SACS qualified (part-time)	Done	Yes	Specific data not provided	Yes
Community Services	26	V A 3 a	8	All faculty SACS qualified (part-time)	Done	Yes	All current	Yes
Secondary Education	27	V B 3 a	1, 3, 4	All faculty annually evaluated by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Secondary Education	28	V B 3 b	1, 3, 4	All faculty have 5-year professional development plans	Done	Yes		Yes
	29	V C 1 a	8	Start faculty salary increase greater than district	Done	Yes	Detailed data presented	Yes
	30	V C 1 d	8	Faculty annual attrition no more than 5%	< 5%	Yes		Yes
VI LEARNING RESOURCES	31	VI A 1 a	9	80% of LRC equipment is functional	84%	Yes		Yes
Pensacola LRC	32	VI A 1 a	9	80% of LRC equipment is functional	85%	Yes		Yes
Warrington LRC	33	VI A 1 a	9	80% of LRC equipment is functional	78%	No		Yes
Milton LRC	34	VI A 1 a	9	80% of LRC equipment is functional	90%	Yes		Yes
	35	VI A 1 b	9	70% high faculty satisfaction with technology and equipment	74%	Yes		Yes
Pensacola LRC	36	VI A 1 b	9	70% high faculty satisfaction with technology and equipment	87%	Yes		Yes
Warrington LRC	37	VI A 1 b	9	70% high faculty satisfaction with technology and equipment	39%	Yes		Yes
Milton LRC	38	VI A 1 b	9	70% high faculty satisfaction with technology and equipment	> 70%	Yes	No specific data provided	Yes
	39	VI A 4 a	9	Books and serials meet national standards	Yes	Yes	National standards not quantified	Yes
Pensacola LRC	40	VI A 4 a	9	Books and serials meet national standards	71 & 73%	Yes		Yes
Warrington LRC	41	VI A 4 a	9	Books and serials meet national standards	59% Books	No		Yes
Milton LRC	42	VI A 4 a	9	Books and serials meet national standards	Yes > 50%	Yes		Yes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE I.

(1) Functional Area:	(2) No.	(3) Citation:	(4) Strategic Goal(s) Cited:	(5) Abbreviated Indicator Standard:	(6) Actual Data for 1995-1996:	(7) Was Standard Achieved?	(8) Commentary:	(9) Was Data Used
	43	VI A 5.c	9	70% high faculty and student satisfaction	94%	Yes		Yes
Pensacola LRC	44	VI A 5.c	9	70% high faculty and student satisfaction	95%	Yes		Yes
Warrington LRC	45	VI A 5.c	9	70% high faculty and student satisfaction	93%	Yes		Yes
Milton LRC	46	VI A 5.c	9	70% high faculty and student satisfaction	90%	Yes		Yes
	47	VI B 2.a	9	70% high satisfaction with developmental services	85%	Yes		Yes
Pensacola LRC	48	VI B 2.a	9	70% high satisfaction with developmental services	90%	Yes		Yes
Warrington LRC	49	VI B 2.a	9	70% high satisfaction with developmental services	77%	Yes		Yes
Milton LRC	50	VI B 2.a	9	70% high satisfaction with developmental services	80%	Yes		Yes
	51	VI B 3.a	9	70% high satisfaction of staff with developmental activities	87.5%	Yes	"Good" or "Adequate"	Yes
VII INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT	52	VII A 1.a	1, 7, 9	70% high satisfaction of faculty and students with labs	78.8-97.8%	Yes		Yes
VIII COMPUTER RESOURCES	53	VIII A 2.a	11	70% high satisfaction with computer system	72.7-81.99%	Yes		Yes
	54	VIII B 1.b	11	70% high satisfaction with computer software	69.6%	Yes		Yes
	55	VIII B 2.a	11	70% high satisfaction of President's Council MIS priority	69.3%	No		No
	56	VIII B 3.a	11	70% high satisfaction of MIS users	72.65%	Yes		Yes
	57	VIII B 4.a	11	70% high satisfaction of software users	62.5%	No		Yes
	58	VIII C 2.a	11	70% high satisfaction of microcomputer software users	79.2%	Yes		Yes
Academic Resources Labs	59	VIII C 4.a	11	70% high satisfaction of lab users	75%	Yes	Now under Denis Campeau	Yes
	60	VIII D 4.a	11	70% high satisfaction with telecommunications	61.2%	No		Yes
IX ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION	61	IX A 1.a	5, 6, 7	Organizational chart, policies, etc. distributed	Done	Yes		Yes
	62	IX A 1.b	5, 6, 7	Personnel listing published	Done	Yes		Yes
	63	IX B 1.d *	5, 6, 7	Produce equity report	Done	Yes		Yes
X FINANCIAL RESOURCES	64	X A 1.a **	2	Review Business Affairs organization	Done	Yes		Yes
	65	X A 2.a **	2	Verify strategic goals in 1996/7 budgets	Done	Yes		Yes
	66	X A 3.a **	2	Verify chart of accounts by NACUBO standards	Done	Yes		Yes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE L

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Functional Area:	No.	Citation:	Strategic Goal(s) Cited:	Abbreviated Indicator Standard:	Actual Data for 1995-1996:	Was Standard Achieved?	Commentary:	Was Data Used
	67.	X B 1.a **	2	Verify investment rates.	Done	Yes		Yes
	68	X B 2 a **	2	Verify accounts payable discounts	Done	Yes		Yes
	69	X B 3 a **	2	Review automated purchasing system.	Done	Yes		Yes
	70	X B 3 b **	2	Review purchasing bid/quote limits.	Done	Yes		Yes
	71	X B 4 a **	2	Verify automated billing and telephone registration systems	Done	Yes		Yes
	72	X B 5 a **	2	Review central stores inventory	Done	Yes	Ctl Stores to be dis in 1996/7	Yes
	73	X B 6 a **	2	Verify fee audits	Done	Yes		Yes
	74	X B 6 b **	2	Verify fee data	Done	Yes		Yes
	75	X B 7 a **	2	Verify that fees are mandated by Board of Trustees	Done	Yes		Yes
	76	X B 8 a **	2	Review delinquent accounts	Done	Yes		Yes
	77	X B 9.a	2	Verify refund policy and practice.	Done	Yes		Yes
XI PHYSICAL RESOURCES	78	XI A 1 a	7	90% satisfaction with new construction	100%	Yes		Yes
	79	XI C 1 a	7	Vehicle age of no more than 7 years or 100,000 miles	9 yrs & 49K	No		Yes
Grounds	80	XI C 2 a	7**	70% satisfaction with grounds	> 70%	Yes	No specific data provided	Yes
Maintenance	81	XI C 2 a	7	70% satisfaction with maintenance	70% equiv	Yes		Yes
Maintenance	82	XI C 3 a	7	64 5K BTU/SF/YR energy consumption	> Goal	No		Yes
Maintenance	83	XI D 1 a	7	SREF deficiencies < 1/Bldg. (safety)	< Goal	No		Yes
Grounds	84	XI D 1 a	7**	SREF deficiencies < 1/Bldg. (safety)	> Goal	Yes		Yes
XII GRANTS	85	XII A 1 a	2	70% high satisfaction rating	72%	Yes	Grants funding to be transferred in 96/97	Yes
Vocational Office	86	XII A 2 a	2	70% high satisfaction rating	> 70%	Yes	No specific data	Yes
Educational Talent Search	87	XII B 1 a **	2	To submit periodic reports	Done	Yes		Yes
E O C	88	XII B 1 a **	2	To submit periodic reports	Done	Yes		Yes
XIII INSTRUCTION Secondary Education	89	XIII A 2 a	1. 3. 4	Maintain course outlines for all courses.	Done	Yes		Yes
Secondary Education	90	XIII A 2 b	1. 3. 4	Provide course outlines for all students.	Done	Yes		Yes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE I.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Functional Area:	**No.**	**Citation:**	**Strategic Goal(s) Cited:**	**Abbreviated Indicator Standard:**	**Actual Data for 1995-1996:**	**Was Standard Achieved?**	**Commentary:**	**Was Data Used**
Visual Arts	91	XIII B 1.a.	1, 3, 7	Provide course outlines for all students.	Done	Yes		Yes
Mathematics	92	XIII B 1.a	1	Provide course outlines for all students	Done	Yes		No
Developmental Studies	93	XIII B 1.a	1, 3, 7	Provide course outlines for all students	Done	Yes		Yes
Business, etc. (Warrington)	94	XIII B 1.a***	1	Provide course outlines for all students.	Done	Yes		Yes
Liberal Arts (Milton)	95	XIII B 1.b	1	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Public Service Careers	96	XIII B 1.b	1, 3, 7	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Culinary Arts	97	XIII B.1.b	1, 3, 7	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Cosmetology	98	XIII B 1.b	1, 3, 7	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Advanced Technology	99	XIII B 1.b	1, 3, 7	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	> 70%	Yes		Yes
English	100	XIII B 1.b	1, 3, 7	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	92%	Yes		Yes
Health & Human Performance	101	XIII B 1.b	1, 3, 7	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Developmental Studies	102	XIII B 1.b	1, 3, 7	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	> 70%	Yes		Yes
History, Languages, Philosophy	103	XIII B 1.b	1, 3, 7	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Behavioral Sciences	104	XIII B 1.b	1	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Biological Science	105	XIII B 1.b	1	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	93%	Yes		Yes
Science & Math (Milton)	106	XIII B 1.b	1	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	85%	Yes		Yes
Physical Science	107	XIII B 1.b	1	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	81%	Yes		Yes
Business	108	XIII B 1.b	1	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	88%	Yes		Yes
Computer Science	109	XIII B 1.b	1	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	88%	Yes		Yes
Music & Drama	110	XIII B 1.b	1	70% of students believe evaluation very appropriate	87%	Yes		Yes
	111	XIII B 1.c	1, 3, 7	College CLAST scores no less than state mean	< s	No		Yes
Liberal Arts (Milton)	112	XIII B 2.b	1	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Public Service Careers	113	XIII B 2.b	1, 3, 7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Culinary Arts	114	XIII B 2.b	1, 3, 7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly	> 70%	Yes		Yes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE I.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Functional Area:	No.	Citation:	Strategic Goal(s) Cited:	Abbreviated Indicator Standard:	Actual Data for 1995-1996:	Was Standard Achieved?	Commentary:	Was Data Used
Cosmetology	115	XIII B 2 b.	1, 3, 7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Advanced Technology	116	XIII B 2 b.	1, 3, 7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	> 70%	Yes		Yes
English	117	XIII B 2 b.	3	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	88%	Yes		Yes
Health & Human Performance	118	XIII B 2 b.	1, 3, 7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Mathematics	119	XIII B 2 b.	7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	< 70%	No		No
History, Languages, Philosophy	120	XIII B 2 b.	3	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Behavioral Sciences	121	XIII B 2 b.	3	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Biological Science	122	XIII B 2 b.	1, 3, 7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	95%	Yes		Yes
Physical Science	123	XIII B 2 b.	1, 3, 7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	82%	Yes		Yes
Math & Science (Milton)	124	XIII B 2 b.	3	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	89%	Yes		Yes
Visual Arts	125	XIII B 2 b.	1, 3, 7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	> 70%	Yes		Yes
NAS Center	126	XIII B 2 b.	1, 3, 7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	> 70%	Yes		No
Business	127	XIII B 2 b.	7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	89%	Yes		Yes
Computer Science	128	XIII B 2 b.	1, 3, 7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	93%	Yes		No
Music & Drama	129	XIII B 2 b.	1, 3, 7	70% students rank evaluation (grading) practice highly.	85%	Yes		Yes
English	130	XIII B 2 c.	3	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations.	Done	Yes		Yes
Liberal Arts (Milton)	131	XIII B 2 c.	1	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations.	Not Done	No		Yes
Public Service Careers	132	XIII B 2 c.	1, 3, 7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations.	Done	Yes		Yes
Culinary Arts	133	XIII B 2 c.	1, 3, 7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations.	Done	Yes		Yes
Cosmetology	134	XIII B 2 c.	1, 3, 7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations.	Done	Yes		Yes
Advanced Technology	135	XIII B 2 c.	1, 3, 7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations.	Done	Yes		Yes
Health & Human Performance	136	XIII B 2 c.	1, 3, 7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations.	Done	Yes		Yes
Developmental Studies	137	XIII B 2 c.	1, 3, 7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations.	Done	Yes		Yes
Mathematics	138	XIII B 2 c.	7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations.	Done	Yes		No

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE I.

(1) Functional Area:	(2) No.	(3) Citation:	(4) Strategic Goal(s) Cited:	(5) Abbreviated Indicator Standard:	(6) Actual Data for 1995-1996:	(7) Was Standard Achieved?	(8) Commentary:	(9) Was Data Used
History, Languages, Philosophy	139	XIII B 2 c	3	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations	Done	Yes		Yes
Behavioral Sciences	140	XIII B 2 c	3	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations	Done	Yes		Yes
Biological Science	141	XIII B 2 c	1, 3, 7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations	Done	Yes		Yes
Physical Science	142	XIII B 2 c	1, 3, 7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations	Done	Yes		Yes
Science (Milton)	143	XIII B 2 c	3	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations	Done	Yes		Yes
Visual Arts	144	XIII B 2 c	1, 3, 7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations	Done	Yes		Yes
NAS Center	145	XIII B 2 c	1, 3, 7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations	Done	Yes		No
Business	146	XIII B 2 c	7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations	Done	Yes		Yes
Computer Science	147	XIII B 2 c	1, 3, 7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations	Done	Yes		Yes
Music & Theatre	148	XIII B 2 c	1, 3, 7	Grade distributions considered in faculty evaluations	Not Done	No		Yes
Liberal Arts (Milton)	149	XIII C 1 a	1	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Public Service Careers	150	XIII C 1 a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Culinary Arts	151	XIII C 1 a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Cosmetology	152	XIII C 1 a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Advanced Technology	153	XIII C 1 a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
English	154	XIII C 1 a	3	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Health & Human Performance	155	XIII C 1 a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Developmental Studies	156	XIII C 1 a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Mathematics	157	XIII C 1 a	7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		No
History, Languages, Philosophy	158	XIII C 1 a	3	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Business etc. (Warrington)	159	XIII C 1 a	1	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Behavioral Sciences	160	XIII C 1 a	3	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Biological Science	161	XIII C 1 a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Physical Science	162	XIII C 1 a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE I.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Functional Area:	No.	Citation:	Strategic Goal(s) Cited:	Abbreviated Indicator Standard:	Actual Data for 1995-1996:	Was Standard Achieved?	Commentary:	Was Data Used
Science (Milton)	163	XIII C 1.a	3	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Visual Arts	164	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Adult Basic Education	165	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
NAS Center	166	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		No
Business	167	XIII C 1.a	7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Computer Science	168	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Music & Theatre	169	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Each faculty member to receive an annual written evaluation	Done	Yes		Yes
Liberal Arts (Milton)	170	XIII C 1.a	1	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Public Service Careers	171	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Culinary Arts	172	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Cosmetology	173	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Advanced Technology	174	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
English	175	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Health & Human Performance	176	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Developmental Studies	177	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Mathematics	178	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		No
History, Languages, Philosophy	179	XIII C 1.a	3	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Business, etc. (Warrington)	180	XIII C 1.a	1	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Behavioral Sciences	181	XIII C 1.a	3	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Biological Science	182	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Physical Science	183	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Science (Milton)	184	XIII C 1.a	3	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Visual Arts	185	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Adult Basic Education	186	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Continuing Education	187	XIII C 1.a	3	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
NAS Center	188	XIII C 1.a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		No

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE I.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Functional Area:	**No.**	**Citation:**	**Strategic Goal(s) Cited:**	**Abbreviated Indicator Standard:**	**Actual Data for 1995-1996:**	**Was Standard Achieved?**	**Commentary:**	**Was Data Used**
Business	189	XIII C 1 a	3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Computer Science	190	XIII C 1 a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
Music & Theatre	191	XIII C 1 a	1, 3, 7	Part-time faculty to be evaluated annually by students	Done	Yes		Yes
	192	XIII C 2 a	1, 3, 7	College AA and AS graduation rates will exceed system rates	AA 58.4 v 59.42% AS 97.3 v 75.37%	No Yes		Yes
Applied Health (Warrington)	193	XIII Alternate	1	Annual sample survey of students	No data	Yes		Yes
Nursing (Warrington)	194	XIII C 1 a	1	Annual sample survey of students	Not done	No		Yes
Math & Science (Warrington)	195	XIII C 1 a	1	Annual sample survey of students	No data	Yes		Yes
Liberal Arts (Warrington)	196	XIII C 1 a	1	Annual sample survey of students	No data	Yes		Yes
Business, etc. (Warrington)	197	XIII Alternate	7	70% student high approval of grading	No data	Yes		Yes
Nursing (Warrington)	198	XIII C 1 a	7	70% student high approval of grading	No data	Yes		Yes
Liberal Arts (Warrington)	199	XIII Alternate	7	Students deem grading appropriate (70%)	84%	Yes		Yes
Applied Health (Warrington)	200	XIII C 1 a	7	Students deem grading appropriate (70%)	> 70%	Yes		Yes
Math & Science (Warrington)	201	XIII C 2 a	7	Students deem grading appropriate (70%)	No data	Yes		Yes
Math & Science (Warrington)	202	XIII C 2 a	7	By *semester* review of grades with faculty	Done	Yes		Yes
Business, etc. (Warrington)	203	XIII C 2 a	7	By *semester* review of grades with faculty	Done	Yes		Yes
Nursing (Warrington)	204	XIII C 2 a	7	By *semester* review of grades with faculty	Done	Yes		Yes
Applied Health (Warrington)	205	XIII C 2 a	7	By *semester* review of grades with faculty	Done	Yes		Yes
Liberal Arts (Warrington)	206	XIII C 2 a	7	By *semester* review of grades with faculty	Not Done	No		Yes
Math & Science (Warrington)	207	XIII C 2 a	7	Annual written evaluation of faculty by April 30	Done	Yes		Yes
Liberal Arts (Warrington)	208	XIII C 2 a	7	Annual written evaluation of faculty by April 30	Done	Yes		Yes
Nursing (Warrington)	209	XIII C 2 a	7	Annual written evaluation of faculty by April 30	Done	Yes		Yes
Applied Health (Warrington)	210	XIII C 2 a	1	Each syllabus reviewed by sixth week of fall semester	Done	Yes		Yes
Liberal Arts (Warrington)	211	XIII C 2 a	1	Each syllabus reviewed by sixth week of fall semester	Done	Yes		Yes
Math & Science (Warrington)	212	XIII C 2 a	1	Each syllabus reviewed by sixth week of fall semester	Done	Yes		Yes
Nursing (Warrington)	213	XIII C 2 a	1	Each syllabus reviewed by sixth week of fall semester	Done	Yes		Yes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE I.

(1) Functional Area:	(2) No.	(3) Citation:	(4) Strategic Goal(s) Cited:	(5) Abbreviated Indicator Standard:	(6) Actual Data for 1995-1996:	(7) Was Standard Achieved?	(8) Commentary:	(9) Was Data Used
XIV INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT:	214	XIV B 1 a	2	Produce publications	Done	Yes		Yes
	215	XIV B 3 a	2	Plan for endowed chairs	Done	Yes		Yes
XV INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH:	216	XV A 2 b	7	70% of research requests supplied in timely manner.	90.9%	Yes		Yes
XVI STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES:	217	XVI A 2 a	9	All college standing committees shall have student members.	All	Yes		Yes
	218	XVI A 3 a	9	All student clubs shall have sponsors.	All	Yes		Yes
	219	XIV A 3 1	9	80% good or excellent advising of S.A.B.'s	87%	Yes		Yes
	220	XIV B 1 b	9	80% of students know where to locate student rights and procedures.	88%	Yes		Yes
Counseling	221	XVI C 1 a	1, 9	80% of student sample have completed, up-to-date information files.	< 80%	No		Yes
Counseling	222	XVI C 4 c	1, 9	100% of students professionally advised.	< 100%	No		Yes
Counseling	223	XVI C 6 a	1, 9	100% of counselors to have crisis training.	< 100%	No		Yes
Public Safety	224	XVI D 2 a	1, 9	5% annual decrease of personal injury on campus.	No data	Yes		Yes
Athletics	225	XVI F 2 a	9	100% of activities assistants trained in first aid and CPR.	100%	Yes		Yes
Financial Aid	226	XVI G 1 c	9	100% of financial aid publications reviewed annually.	100%	Yes		Yes
Financial Aid	227	XVI G 1 a	9	70% high student satisfaction of financial aid publications.	94%	Yes		Yes
Health Services	228	XVI I 2 a	7	70% high student satisfaction with health information.	100%	Yes		Yes
Health Services	229	XVI I 1 a	7	80% high student satisfaction with health services.	100%	Yes		Yes
Student Job Services	230	XVI J 1 a	9	70% high student satisfaction with job services.	< 70%	No		Yes
Disabled Services	231	XVI K 1 a	9	Annual survey of student satisfaction.	80%	Yes		Yes
				ADDITIONAL ITEMS				
Audiovisual Equipment	232	VII B 1 a	1, 7, 9, 11	70% high faculty satisfaction with equipment	Pending	Pending		Yes
Audiovisual Equipment	233	VII B 1 b	1, 7, 9, 11	70% high student satisfaction with equipment	Pending	Pending		Yes

(a) Source: PJC Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Report Forms received 1996, from PJC academic, student service and support units. (Full reports are produced in APPENDIX A)
* New item
** Revised in 1995-1996
*** Non-standard indicator

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE II.

ANALYSIS OF REPORTED INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS (a)
1995-1996
(YEAR IV)

TOTAL INDICATOR REPORTS RECEIVED		233	100.0%
PRODUCTIVITY INDICATORS REPORT RECEIVED		3	1.3%
PRODUCTIVITY INDICATORS REPORTS ACHIEVED	100.0%	3	1.3%
PROCESS INDICATOR REPORTS RECEIVED		230	98.7%
PROCESS INDICATORS ACHIEVED	90.0%	207	88.8%
ALL INDICATORS ACHIEVED		207	88.8%
INDIVIDUAL INDICATORS DATA USED (of a possible 252)		97	38.3%

(a) Source: Tabulated from TABLE I. data.

TABLE III.
LIST OF UNREPORTED INDICATORS THROUGH 1995-1996*

New I.A.1.b.	IV.C.4.b.	XIII.C.1.c.	XVI.E.3.b.
New I.A.1.c.	IV.D.2.a.	XIII.C.2.b.	XVI.E.3.c.
New I.A.1.d.	IV.D.3.a.	XIII.C.2.c.	XVI.F.1.b.
New I.A.3.a.	IV.D.3.b.	IX.A.3.a.	XVI.F.1.c
New I.A.3.b.	V.A.1.a.	IX.A.5.a.	XVI.F.2.a.
New I.E.2.a.	V.B.1.a.(1)	XI.B.1.a.	XVI.H.3.a.
New XVI.H.2.b.	V.B.1.a.(3)	XIII.C.3.a.	
New XVI.B.2.b.	V.C.1.c.	XIII.C.3.b.	
I.C.1.b.	V.C.1.e.	XIII.C.4.a.	
I.C.2.a.	V.C.2.a.	XIII.C.4.b.	
I.D.1.b.	V.C.4.a.	XIV.C.2.a.	
II.A.1.a.	VI.A.5.a.	XIX.C.2.a.	
III.A.1.b.	IX.A.3.a.	XIX.C.3.b.	
III.A.1.c.	IX.A.5.a.	XIV.C.4.a.	
III.A.1.d.	XI.B.1.a.	XV.A.3.a.	
III.A.1.e.	XII.A.2.c.	XV.A.5.b.	
III.A.2.a.	XII.B.2.a.	XVI.C.1.b.	
III.A.2.b.	XIII.A.1.b.	XVI.C.2.a.	
III.A.2.b.	XIII.A.1.c.	XVI.C.4.a.	
III.A.2.d.	XIII.A.3.a.	XVI.C.5.a.	
IV.A.2.a.	XIII.A.3.b.	XVI.C.5.b.	
IV.A.3.d.	XIII.A.4.a.	XVI.D.1.a.	
IV.A.3.e.	XIII.A.4.b.	XVI.D.1.b.	
IV.B.1.a.	XIII.A.4.c.	XVI.D.3.a.	
IV.B.3.b.	XIII.A.5.a.	XVI.E.1.b.	
IV.B.3.d.	XIII.A.5.b.	XVI.E.2.a.	
IV.B.3.e.	XIII.A.6.b.	XVI.E.2.b.	
IV.C.3.a.	XIII.B.2.a.	XVI.E.3.a.	

* As of 7-31-96